

National Republican.

A. M. CLAPP, EDITOR.
THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN
Is published daily (except Sundays) by
The Republican Printing and Publishing Company,
at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and
Thirteenth Street.
TERMS: \$5.00 per year in advance.
One copy one month.
Advertisements by contract.
The National Republican is the only daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia.
Mr. Davidson is the Agent for the receipt of Advertisements and Subscriptions for this Paper, also for the Collection of Accounts.

Largest legitimate morning circulation in the District.
THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN
is the only daily Republican journal at the National Capital. Its general and local news facilities are such as to render it the most thorough newspaper south of Philadelphia. Its telegraph arrangements are the most perfect and reliable than those of any other morning journal here. Its corps of local, departmental, and Congressional reporters are intelligent, experienced, and efficient, and it never allows itself to be outdone in editorial enterprise or news in any direction.

Politically THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN is a fearless and ready defender of the Republican faith—never shrinking from duty or responsibility, but dealing with all questions of political concernment in a just, frank, and fearless manner. It battles for the right to elect as it deems right. It attacks all the policies, propensities, and moralities of life in its conduct, sacrificing none of its policy, expediency, or so-called journalistic enterprise, and in this way it strives to secure public respect, confidence, and success. It now has a larger circulation than it has had for many years, and it is laboring, and will continue to labor, to increase the measure of its circulation and usefulness, and all it asks to aid in the accomplishment of its work is the generous co-operation and encouragement of Republicans here and elsewhere.

It circulates largely among the better class of families and sojourners at the National Capital, and hence is a valuable advertising medium for merchants, manufacturers, dealers in real estate, house agents, railroad and steamboat lines, and all other departments of business which look to the public for patronage.

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN has one of the most perfect printing establishments in the country—not only for newspaper, but for Book and Job Printing in all their varieties.

With such purposes and resources THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN seeks that support and encouragement which its enterprise and efforts deserve. It proposes to make a gallant fight for the supremacy of Republican principles in the nation, and expects to raise and sustain the banner of victory in 1880.

WASHINGTON, APRIL 8, 1879.

THE possibility, asserted in Democratic circles, that the President will sign the army bill, political rider and all, need create no alarm.

The 4 per. cents are booming. The assurance of a complete Republican victory next year serves to stimulate public confidence in the stability of the Government credit.

THURMAN and WALLACE are the new hard-and-soft money Bourbon ticket for 1880. TILDEN and RANDALL—the Siamese Sams, so to speak—are getting ready to sit down upon it.

ANDREW JACKSON'S fame rests mainly upon the fact that he vetoed nine bills during his career as President, several of which were appropriation bills. He was a Democratic President, and was dealing with fellow-Democrats in Congress at that.

CONGRESSMAN O'REILLY, of Brooklyn, who has been riding two horses in the Congressional chaise during the session, has had his Alternation tag taken from under him by the Supreme Court of this State. He is only a Congressman now—a most miserable state for such a statesman.

"THEY" now propose to make appropriations for six months only, instead of the full fiscal year, and then adjourn. In other words, "they" are getting ready to dismount from the high horse they straddled at the beginning of the extra session. "They" don't believe in riding rough shod over the Executive so much as they did.

THE Republican party is booming. No matter what the result of the pending contest in Congress may be, it has served to arouse the thorough inspirations of patriotic duty the country over, and, as a natural consequence, the Republican party is as solid and unbroken now as it was in 1868, or as it ever has been since it came into existence.

CARTER HARRISON is still booming. The Greenbackers and their allies, the Democrats, now propose to nominate him for Governor. The grand jury sits in this city soon and then he may get an endorsement by way of send off. He has friends here who will look everything in his way possible to give him a lift into the gubernatorial chair with a distinctive uniform to match.

MR. HAZELLON, of Wisconsin, is now assured of an undisturbed tenure in his seat in the House. There never was any valid reason why his seat should be contested; but the withdrawal of the notice of contest against him will serve to insure his constituency that they will continue to be acceptably represented by him, free from theavoring uncertainties of the decision of a Democratic majority in such cases.

THE Richmond Dispatch, with becoming plety of heart and purpose, exclaims, in regard to the pending colored hegira at the South: "We have everything to hope from a just Providence." The old lady, when her horse ran away, said she put her trust in Providence until the breeding broke, and then she gave up in despair. The Dispatch should turn its attention to the breeding. That's where the danger is now.

THE Canadian Conservatives are very indignant, because when Sir JOHN McDONALD, the Premier, consented to the summary removal of the Liberal Lieutenant-Governor of the Dominion, on account of his Liberalism, and the question was presented to Lord LORNE for his assent, he innocently replied, "I will ask my ma?" The

Canadians pride themselves upon their loyalty to the Crown, but they are very restless and irate whenever the shadow of the Crown is thrust between them and their provincial affluents. Just now Canada is red hot, and Lord LORNE finds the heat uncomfortable.

THE TILDEN bargain for 1880 leaves HENDRICKS out in the cold. Indiana is a certain (?) Democratic State—the tall-piece of the Solid South. Pennsylvania is an uncertain (?) Republican State. HENDRICKS is therefore a superfluous and Randall a necessity in the new Gambley Park combination. The ticket next year will therefore be, if TILDEN can manage it to suit himself, composed of the two SAMS—SAM TILDEN and SAM RANDALL. Apocryphal Psalms, they are, at the best.

RAYARD and THURMAN are both on record regarding the Chinese question. The California Democracy are consequently thoroughly posted regarding the probabilities that would ensue in the improbable event that either of these gentlemen should become President. But they don't know how TILDEN stands. They want to hear from him in the premises, and the San Francisco Post thoughtfully suggests that there shall be no ciphering business about his explanation.

THE Southern Bourbon press are now calling a halt to the Okoloma (Miss) Southern States, for the reason that it leads them. They are all traveling in the same direction and on the same track; but, much to their chagrin, the Southern States is running with a higher head of steam, and hence leads them in the race. They have fallen to abusing it most lustily, but it doesn't slacken speed, we notice. It is honest and fearless in its honesty. That's the difference between it and its laggard revilers.

NEXT winter, at the regular session, if not before, the attempt to place JEFF DAVIS on the list of pensioners—the Nation's Roll of Honor—will be renewed. The Bourbons cannot, dare not, abandon this project. It is in the natural course of things; for so long as JEFF DAVIS remains excluded from that list just so long will a certain odium—very faint, it is true—attach to the Southern Confederates because of their treason. The logical argument in the premises is that to exclude him from the pension list is to stigmatize all of his Confederate associates and followers.

If any man can read in the light of ordinary intelligence the debates in the House of last week without reaching the conclusion that modern Democracy is indissolubly welded to the Lost Cause we are sadly mistaken. From first to last the Democratic assertion was in favor of the supremacy of the State over the National Government and the utter inability of the latter to protect itself in the matter of the election of its own officials against the encroachments of the former. This is secession, mildly asserted, and nothing less.

AND all this only moves us to say that there never would have been any trouble between the races in the South if the Republican party had not instigated it.—Lynchburg Virginian.

And this assertion moves us to say that it is a base falsehood and a calumny upon the Republican party. The trouble between the races in the South has arisen out of Democratic social and political ostracism for color and opinion sake, and the introduction of a system of Democratic intimidation and murder on account of colored citizenship and its exercise against the Democrats at the polls.

As well might our parliamt cotemporary charge that the Republican party fired the first gun against Sumter.

It is claimed that the army bill as it now stands awaiting action in the Senate does not prohibit the President from responding to a legitimate call for "troops" in the event of domestic violence in the States, nor does it restrict him from the proper use of the army in emergencies which are disconnected with the proceedings immediately attendant upon national elections. But this construction is at variance with the ideas of the Republicans of the House. If it were correct there would be nothing in the law to which the President entertains any serious objection, and it would be safe to assume that he would approve it without delay as an independent proposition.

THE Boston Globe is thoroughly dough-faced Bourbon, and it says it thinks that General GRANT cannot carry a single Northern State. If it has any confidence in such a declaration, and is as thrifty as the average New Englander in the way of money-making, we can, we think, put it in the way of turning an honest penny one way or the other. We are authorized to offer it a wager of \$100 on each Northern State, if General GRANT is the candidate in 1880, that he will carry each in that contest. We are not favorable to betting on elections, but we have a friend who has some idle capital and some confidence in General GRANT's popularity, and to sweeten such a wager he will add to the above proposition another of \$100 that GRANT will carry all the Northern States, should he be a candidate.

THE South seems determined upon every possible occasion to assert State Rights in derogation and in defiance of the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of precipitating another collision. Under our Department news will be found a statement relating to the action of the State of Georgia in issuing a bill of credit as money, which is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States. To issue this paper is no more to be tolerated than secession, though it does not involve an act of violence, except that violence may ensue should the Government feel called upon to take action against this open and defiant infringement of the fundamental law. It is a symptom of the disease which is rapidly pressing on toward revolution. This conduct on the part of Georgia will in all probability lead to some action on the part of the Government.

EX-SECRETARY ROBINSON can well withstand the sneers of such a man as Mr. BLACKBURN. He spoke in defense of the so-called bayonet act from the standpoint of experience, for, as a member of President GRANT'S Cabinet, he had opportunities of witnessing its operation and faithful execution. He could, and should, in our opinion, have told Mr. BLACKBURN that the repeated failures of the Government to enforce its provision have resulted in the overthrow of

of true Republicanism in the fairness and execution of the State governments in the South. Loyal bayonets have never in the history of this Government prevented or interfered with a legal and peaceable election; but their absence from the polls has been taken advantage of by the Ku-Klux, White Leaguers, and Rifle Clubs of the Southern Democracy to destroy the purity of the ballot-box and overthrow free government in that section.

A FIRE-EATER'S CHALLENGE.

MR. BLACKBURN, who has been characterized as the rhetorical flambeau of Kentucky, and who may be regarded as the boss fire-eater of the South in Congress at the present time, has had his say, and he spoke up loud and plain like a little man. He made the following distinct, unequivocal, and defiant proclamation of the purposes of the South in a recent speech on the floor of Congress, which is attracting much attention throughout the North and is exciting some alarm among Northern Democrats. He said: "We do not intend to stop 'until we have stricken the last vestige of your war measures from the statute book.'"

And this pronouncement is made in behalf of the Democratic party and by authority. It gives notice of intention, and in terms not to be mistaken. The Confederate brigadiers, of whom BLACKBURN is chief, have determined to strike from the statute book the last vestige of the war measures that attended the rebellion and became incidents of that bloody attempt to destroy the Union, overturn the Constitution, and tear down the Government of the United States. He admits of no exceptions. The whole must go, and the Confederates have decreed it, and give notice that they will not stop until the work is fully accomplished.

Among the war measures that followed after we had mastered our army and put it in the field to crush the rebellion, was the proclamation of freedom which struck the shackles of slavery from four millions of our people. Then followed the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution, and the laws for their proper enforcement. All these were war measures, then, and are so regarded now. The laws intended to protect all citizens in their right of suffrage in all the States of the sustained Union were also regarded as war measures, and now come under the ban and malediction of this stalwart Confederate brigadier who becomes chief trumpeter for the rebel hosts, and who proclaims that the last vestige of them are to be wiped from the statute book of the nation by the ruthless hands that would have wiped the Union out of existence if they had had the power.

This proclamation of traitors and rebels now should convince the loyal people of these United States that the war did not end with the surrender at Appomattox. That event was only a lull in the storm, that it might, under a temporary rest, gather strength for fresh fury in another and no less offensive and mischievous direction. Step by step, under the clemency of the victors in the struggle on the field, these enemies of the Union, these traitors to the Constitution, these rebels in arms, have steadily plotted to render the fruits of the war worthless to the country, and of no avail in its future peace, unity, and prosperity. They now fancy that their advantage is so secure, they established that they can tear the Constitution in pieces; strip the laws for its enforcement from the statute book; remain four millions of people to slavery; strip the citizen of his rights, and subjugate the nation and its Government to the evil intents of its worst enemies. This is the avowed purpose of Mr. BLACKBURN, who forfeited his life by a treason that should never have been forgiven under any condonation, save that which is provided for treason under the laws of the country. The issue is now presented. The gauntlet is thrown at the feet of loyalty, and it would be sheer cowardice not to lift it and accept the issue with the same determination to defend the Constitution and the laws from violation that attended the loyalists in the dark days of the rebellion.

THE GREENBACK SURRENDER.

THE Nationals, or Greenbackers, as they are pleased alternately to call themselves, delivered the goods on Saturday, and now everything is serene. This is as we expected. The laws of gravitation have wrought their legitimate mission and landed these patriots where they belong. When a Republican loses hold upon his political faith and virtue and begins to dally with strange political gods he inevitably abandons himself to the deepest political prostitution upon the first favorable opportunity and bid. The bid was made and the yielding occurred on Saturday, and now the Greenbackers in Congress, with two or three honorable exceptions, are fairly enrolled on the Confederate roster. Some belonged there from the first, but the balance, who surrendered, most cheerfully prostituted themselves to the uses and purposes of the Confederates for less money than JUDAS ISCARIOT got for the betrayal of his Master. It is well that this masquerading under the pretense of Republicanism on all national questions not purely financial should come to an end this early, for hereafter if any body is deceived and cheated it will be the Confederates. We had hoped better things of Messrs. WEAVER and DE LA MATY, but when men get to going bad, there is little hope of their getting back. We may now expect that DE LA MATY will out Horns Hagan in his devotion to the worst phases and plots of Bourbonism, under the directing finger of Senator McDONALD and the convulsive convulsions of Senator VOORHEES. The desertion of Republicanism by Mr. WEAVER will subject him to the judgment of a constituency that has been cruelly betrayed, and which will hold him to a rigid accountability. No Iowa Republican can throw himself into the arms of the Confederacy in this crisis without paying a penalty that no statesman who desires a future can afford. However, the sale and delivery have been accomplished, and now we leave these traitors to principle to occupy the beds they have deliberately prepared for themselves. The fate of the apostate is to be "unrepented, unrepented, and unrepented." Greenbackism has digged its own grave in this surrender to the enemies of the Union, and its plant subjects will realize the fact that a grave, wherever found, preaches a short and pithy sermon.

THE LYNCHBURG VIRGINIAN must have very feeble reasoning faculties if it imagines that the admission of the right of a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision making preparation of poll-tax a qualification for voting, yields the whole question discussed in THE REPUBLICAN recently under the above caption. The position taken by us was this: The organic or statutory law of a State that makes the payment of a poll-tax a necessary qualification for voting, is an abridgment of the right to vote within the meaning of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and therefore the said amendment makes it obligatory upon Congress to reduce the representation of Virginia in Congress, and of such other States as may have prescribed such a qualification for suffrage, in the proportion which the number of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, who have been so abridged of their right to vote, shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State. We referred to Virginia and the South, for they only could such a restriction have any practical application for obvious reasons. Instead of meeting the issue discussed like a reasonable being and attempting to refute our argument or frankly admitting our position, the Lynchburg Virginian evades the only question involved in our articles, by quoting a recent amendment to the constitution of Virginia which makes the payment of a capitation tax a pre-requisite for voting. The intelligent editor addresses his intelligent readers and proceeds to knock the props from our argument as to Virginia with a logic peculiar to no other region. He says: "THE REPUBLICAN doesn't seem to have learned that voting is not a right of citizenship, but a privilege. It is not accorded to all citizens alike. Women are citizens, but they are not voters. And paupers are citizens, entitled to the protection of the law, but they are not permitted to vote in Virginia and some other States."

THE ARGUMENT OF THE REPUBLICAN is long and labored, and winds up with the declaration that the representation of Congress from the Southern States ought to be cut down to the extent that "disfranchisement" is wrought through the operation of the laws requiring the payment of a poll-tax before voting. (What of Massachusetts, in that case?) The reader will please note what we have placed in italics, and then read the following words: "The constitution of Virginia, article III, section 1: 'Every male citizen of the United States (female citizens are excluded from the right to vote) who shall have been a resident of the State twelve months, and of the county, city, or town in which he shall offer to vote three months next preceding any election, shall have paid to the State, before the day of election, the capitation tax required by law for the preceding year, shall be entitled to vote.'"

(Our readers will please to note that the section of the Constitution quoted is from Article III.) Now, let it be remembered that THE REPUBLICAN concedes the right of every State to incorporate in its organic law a provision, as we have shown exists in the constitution of Virginia, that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its organic law a provision that in such State specifically that the validity of such a law "depends on the constitution of the United States." We have shown that the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, does not permit a State to incorporate in its